

## REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on April 19, 2007 in the above-referenced application, Applicant respectfully requests amendment of the above-identified application in the manner identified above and that the patent be granted in view of the arguments presented. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

### Present Status of Application

Claims 22, 23, 36 and 41 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Claims 19 and 24 are objected to for alleged redundancies. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cho et al (US 6,411,501, hereinafter "Cho"). Claims 2, 8, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Kim et al (US 6,501,641, hereinafter "Kim"). Claims 19, 20, 24, 25, 32, 37, 39, 40 and 42 are allowed over the prior art. Claims 9 and 46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this paper, claims 1, 7, 19, 23, and 43 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Fig. 6A and the related description of the application as originally filed. Claims 4-6, 11, 22, 24, 36, 41, 45 are canceled. Thus, on entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 7-10, 12, 19-20, 23, 25, 32, 37, 39-40, 42-44 and 46 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the remarks contained below.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 19, 20, 24, 25, 32, 37, 39, 40 and 42 and indication that claims 19 and 46 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Objections

The amendment of claims 19 and 23 and cancellation of claims 22, 24, 36 and 41 are believed to overcome or otherwise render moot the objections to the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cho. To the extent that the grounds of the rejections may be applied to the claims now pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

The rejection of a claim for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that the prior art reference include every element of the rejected claim. Furthermore, as stated by the Federal Circuit, the prior art reference must disclose each element of the claimed invention "arranged as in the claim." *Lindermann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Amended claim 1 recites a flat panel display comprising a housing, a panel module, and a main bracket. The panel module has a front frame, a rear frame, and a panel. The front frame is assembled with the rear frame to encase the panel. The rear frame has at least one connecting portion. A part of the connecting portion is covered by the panel. The connecting portion is an L-shaped protrusion. The main bracket connects the housing and the connecting portion of the rear frame.

Cho teaches a display assembly having a display module 10 and a display case 30. The display module 10 has a display panel 12, and first and second frames 16a and 16b. The second frame 16b has a fixed hole 15. A hinge frame 20 is positioned on the display case 30. The hinge frame 20 is composed of a pin portion received in fastener fixing holes 19a and an L-shaped portion comprising first and second surfaces 21 and 22. See Fig.12.

In the rejections over Cho, the Examiner respectively identifies second frame 16b and fixed hole 15 as the alleged "rear frame" and "connecting part" of claim 1. See page 3 of the Office action.

However, contrary to the arrangement recited in claim 1, the fixed hole 15 of Cho is not an L-shaped protrusion.

Amended claim 7 discloses a flat panel display comprising a housing, a panel module, and a main bracket. The panel module has a front frame, a rear frame, and a panel. The front frame is assembled with the rear frame to encase the panel. The main bracket is disposed in the housing. The rear frame comprises a receiving portion supporting the panel, a peripheral portion located at periphery of the receiving portion, and at least one connecting portion. A part of the connecting portion is covered by the panel. The connecting portion is an L-shaped protrusion. The main bracket connects the housing and the connecting portion of the rear frame.

As noted above in connection with claim 1, Cho does not teach the arrangement recited in claim 7 in which the connecting portion is an L-shaped protrusion.

Amended claim 43 recites a flat panel display comprising a panel, a front frame, a receiving portion, a peripheral portion, a connecting portion, a housing, and a bracket. The front frame is disposed in front of the panel. The receiving portion is disposed behind the panel. The peripheral portion is located at the periphery of the receiving portion. The connecting portion has an L-shaped protrusion and a connecting surface. The protrusion connects to one of the receiving portion and the peripheral portion. The connecting surface and the protrusion substantially extend to a back of the receiving portion. The housing is engaged with the panel by the connecting surface of the connecting portion. The bracket is disposed between the connecting portion and the housing. The connecting portion and the housing are respectively connected to the bracket at different locations.

As noted above in connection with claims 1 and 7, Cho does not teach the arrangement recited in claim 43 in which the connecting portion is an L-shaped protrusion.

For at least the reasons described above, it is Applicant's belief that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1, 7 and 43. Applicant therefore respectfully

requests that the rejections of claims 1, 7 and 43 be withdrawn and the claim passed to issue. Insofar as claims 2-3, 8-10, 12, 44 and 46 depend from one of claims 1, 7 and 43 either directly or indirectly, and therefore incorporate all of one of the limitations of claims 1, 7 and 43, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2, 8, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho in view of Kim. As noted above, it is Applicant's belief that claims 2, 8, 44 and 45 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1, 7 or 43. Furthermore, Applicant submits that Kim also fails to teach or suggest the recited arrangement in which the connecting portion is an L-shaped protrusion. For this reason, the Examiner's arguments in connection with these claims are considered moot and will not be addressed here.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. **502447**.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nelson A. Quintero/

Nelson A. Quintero

Reg. No. 52,143

Customer No. 34,283

Telephone: (310) 909-8535

P125493NAQ